

# The Potential Fate of Local Model Building

Christoph Lüdeling

bctp and PI, University of Bonn

SUSY 11

Fermilab, August 28, 2011

CL, Hans Peter Nilles, Claudia Christine Stephan

Phys. Rev. **D83** [arXiv:1101.3346]

- F-Theory Model Building: Generalisation of type IIB intersecting branes
- Usually, consider local models: Focus on brane stack or points within the stack and decouple bulk of the compactification manifold
- Advantage: Simple, physics basically fixed by symmetry
- Obvious question: Existence of global completion

- F-Theory Model Building: Generalisation of type IIB intersecting branes
- Usually, consider local models: Focus on brane stack or points within the stack and decouple bulk of the compactification manifold
- Advantage: Simple, physics basically fixed by symmetry
- Obvious question: Existence of global completion
- GUT models need to address proton stability
- Dimension-four proton decay: Forbidden by matter parity or variants – should be defined locally
- Dimension-five proton decay: Use zero mode assignment, i.e. additional  $U(1)$  symmetries present in the setup

- 1 Local Models, Operators and Matter Parity
- 2 The Good, the Bad, the Parity
- 3 Matter Parity in Local Models
- 4 Semilocal Embedding
- 5 Conclusion

[Beasley, Heckman, Vafa; Donagi, Wijnholt; Marsano, Saulina, Schäfer-Nameki; Hayashi, Kawano, Tatar, Watari; Dudas, Palti; Choi, ...]

For F-Theory models, different degrees of locality:

- *Global* model: Specify full compactification space (CY fourfold) – complete, consistent  
[Blumenhagen, Grimm, Jurke, Weigand; Grimm, Krause, Weigand; Knapp, Kreuzer, Mayrhofer, Walliser; Collinucci, Savelli; Braun, Hebecker, CL, Valandro, ...]
- *Semilocal* model: Focus on the GUT surface (brane stack) and matter curves within  $S$  – decouples bulk of compactification space
- *Local* model: Consider only points where matter curves intersect and interactions are localised – simple, hope for predictivity because of local constraints. Certain question cannot be answered, existence of global completion is not guaranteed.

# 8D Gauge Theory Description

- “Brane” picture:  $SU(5)$  gauge theory on 7-branes (8D), matter and interactions localised on intersections: curves and points of higher symmetry, potentially up to  $E_8$
- Focus on GUT surface  $\rightsquigarrow$  8D  $E_8$  GUT, broken to  $SU(5)$  by adjoint Higgs
- Actually, rank-preserving breaking

$$E_8 \longrightarrow (SU(5) \times SU(5)_\perp) \longrightarrow SU(5) \times U(1)^4$$

- Extra  $U(1)$ 's generically massive – but remain as *global selection rules*

[Grimm, Weigand]

## Higgs in $SU(5)_\perp$

Higgs field takes values in  $SU(5)_\perp$  – matter curves now visible as vanishing loci of Higgs eigenvalues:

$$\text{Higgs } \Phi \sim \begin{pmatrix} t_1 & & & & \\ & t_2 & & & \\ & & t_3 & & \\ & & & t_4 & \\ & & & & t_5 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sum_i t_i = 0$$

Matter curves:

$$\mathbf{10}: t_i = 0, \quad \mathbf{5}: -(t_i + t_j) = 0, \quad i \neq j$$

$t_i$  double as charges under the extra  $U(1)$ s: for allowed couplings,  $t_i$  sum up to zero.

Monodromies can identify some  $t_i$ : At least  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  required for tree-level top quark Yukawa coupling  $\mathbf{10}_{\text{top}}\mathbf{10}_{\text{top}}\mathbf{5}_{H_u}$

# Superpotential Couplings

$$W_{\text{good}} = \mu \mathbf{5}_{H_u} \bar{\mathbf{5}}_{H_d} + Y_u \mathbf{5}_{H_u} \mathbf{10}_M \mathbf{10}_M + Y_d \bar{\mathbf{5}}_{H_d} \bar{\mathbf{5}}_M \mathbf{10}_M$$

$$W_{\text{bad}} = \beta \mathbf{5}_{H_u} \bar{\mathbf{5}}_M + \lambda \bar{\mathbf{5}}_M \bar{\mathbf{5}}_M \mathbf{10}_M$$

$$+ W^1 \mathbf{10}_M \mathbf{10}_M \mathbf{10}_M \bar{\mathbf{5}}_M + W^2 \mathbf{10}_M \mathbf{10}_M \mathbf{10}_M \bar{\mathbf{5}}_{H_d}$$

$$+ W^3 \bar{\mathbf{5}}_M \bar{\mathbf{5}}_M \mathbf{5}_{H_u} \mathbf{5}_{H_u} + W^4 \bar{\mathbf{5}}_M \bar{\mathbf{5}}_{H_d} \mathbf{5}_{H_u} \mathbf{5}_{H_u}$$

dim-3/4

} dim-5

# Superpotential Couplings

$$W_{\text{good}} = \mu \mathbf{5}_{H_u} \bar{\mathbf{5}}_{H_d} + Y_u \mathbf{5}_{H_u} \mathbf{10}_M \mathbf{10}_M + Y_d \bar{\mathbf{5}}_{H_d} \bar{\mathbf{5}}_M \mathbf{10}_M$$

$$W_{\text{bad}} = \beta \mathbf{5}_{H_u} \bar{\mathbf{5}}_M + \lambda \bar{\mathbf{5}}_M \bar{\mathbf{5}}_M \mathbf{10}_M$$

$$+ W^1 \mathbf{10}_M \mathbf{10}_M \mathbf{10}_M \bar{\mathbf{5}}_M + W^2 \mathbf{10}_M \mathbf{10}_M \mathbf{10}_M \bar{\mathbf{5}}_{H_d}$$

$$+ W^3 \bar{\mathbf{5}}_M \bar{\mathbf{5}}_M \mathbf{5}_{H_u} \mathbf{5}_{H_u} + W^4 \bar{\mathbf{5}}_M \bar{\mathbf{5}}_{H_d} \mathbf{5}_{H_u} \mathbf{5}_{H_u}$$

dim-3/4

} dim-5

Some terms related by interchange  $\bar{\mathbf{5}}_{H_d} \leftrightarrow \bar{\mathbf{5}}_M$  – forbidden by  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  matter parity:

[Dimopoulos, Raby, Wilczek; Ibanez, Ross; Dreiner, Luhn, Thormeier]

	$\mathbf{5}_{H_u}, \bar{\mathbf{5}}_{H_d}$	$\mathbf{10}_M, \bar{\mathbf{5}}_M$
$P_M$	+1	-1

# Superpotential Couplings

$$W_{\text{good}} = \mu \mathbf{5}_{H_u} \bar{\mathbf{5}}_{H_d} + Y_u \mathbf{5}_{H_u} \mathbf{10}_M \mathbf{10}_M + Y_d \bar{\mathbf{5}}_{H_d} \bar{\mathbf{5}}_M \mathbf{10}_M$$

$$W_{\text{bad}} = \beta \cancel{\mathbf{5}_{H_u} \bar{\mathbf{5}}_M} + \lambda \cancel{\mathbf{5}_M \bar{\mathbf{5}}_M \mathbf{10}_M} \quad \text{dim-3/4}$$

$$+ W^1 \mathbf{10}_M \mathbf{10}_M \mathbf{10}_M \bar{\mathbf{5}}_M + \cancel{W^2 \mathbf{10}_M \mathbf{10}_M \mathbf{10}_M \bar{\mathbf{5}}_{H_d}} \quad \left. \vphantom{W^1} \right\} \text{dim-5}$$

$$+ W^3 \bar{\mathbf{5}}_M \bar{\mathbf{5}}_M \mathbf{5}_{H_u} \mathbf{5}_{H_u} + \cancel{W^4 \bar{\mathbf{5}}_M \bar{\mathbf{5}}_{H_d} \mathbf{5}_{H_u} \mathbf{5}_{H_u}}$$

Some terms related by interchange  $\bar{\mathbf{5}}_{H_d} \leftrightarrow \bar{\mathbf{5}}_M$  – forbidden by  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  matter parity:  
 [Dimopoulos, Raby, Wilczek; Ibanez, Ross; Dreiner, Luhn, Thormeier]

	$\mathbf{5}_{H_u}, \bar{\mathbf{5}}_{H_d}$	$\mathbf{10}_M, \bar{\mathbf{5}}_M$
$P_M$	+1	-1

Weinberg operator  $W^3$  and  $W^1 \supset QQQL, \bar{u}\bar{u}\bar{d}\bar{e}$  still allowed.

# Model Requirements

For the local model we require

- $P_M$  defined locally
- heavy top quark (i.e. rank-one up-type Yukawa matrix at tree level – down-type Yukawas can be rank-zero or rank-one)
- No dim-5 proton decay (the  $W^1$  operator forbidden at all orders)
- Masses for all quarks and leptons after switching on VEVs

# Model Requirements

For the local model we require

- $P_M$  defined locally
- heavy top quark (i.e. rank-one up-type Yukawa matrix at tree level – down-type Yukawas can be rank-zero or rank-one)
- No dim-5 proton decay (the  $W^1$  operator forbidden at all orders)
- Masses for all quarks and leptons after switching on VEVs

Local model building freedom: Freely choose

- Monodromy (at least  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  for heavy top)
- Assignment of matter and Higgs zero modes to curves
- Singlet VEVs (for matter parity even singlets)

Define  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  matter parity in terms of the  $t_i$  (i.e. as subgroup of  $SU(5)_\perp$ ):

$$P_M = (-1)^{c_i t_i}, \quad c_i = 0, 1 \quad (\text{defined mod } 2)$$

- Monodromy  $t_1 \leftrightarrow t_2$  requires  $c_1 = c_2 = 1$
- Down-type masses require even number of  $c_i = 1$

Hence, two choices of matter parity:

$$\text{Case I: } P_M = (-1)^{t_1+t_2+t_3+t_4}$$

$$\text{Case II: } P_M = (-1)^{t_1+t_2}$$

# Case I: Matter and VEV Assignment

## Matter **10** Curves

<b>10<sub>1</sub></b>	$t_{1,2}$	—	top
<b>10<sub>2</sub></b>	$t_3$	—	
<b>10<sub>3</sub></b>	$t_4$	—	

## Matter **5** Curves

<b>5<sub>3</sub></b>	$-t_{1,2} - t_5$	—	
<b>5<sub>5</sub></b>	$-t_3 - t_5$	—	
<b>5<sub>6</sub></b>	$-t_4 - t_5$	—	

## Even Singlet Curves

<b>1<sub>1</sub></b>	$\pm (t_{1,2} - t_3)$	+	
<b>1<sub>2</sub></b>	$\pm (t_{1,2} - t_4)$	+	
<b>1<sub>4</sub></b>	$\pm (t_3 - t_4)$	+	
<b>1<sub>7</sub></b>	$t_1 - t_2$	+	

# Case I: Matter and VEV Assignment

## Matter **10** Curves

<b>10</b> <sub>1</sub>	$t_{1,2}$	—	top
<b>10</b> <sub>2</sub>	$t_3$	—	
<b>10</b> <sub>3</sub>	$t_4$	—	

## Matter **5** Curves

<b>5</b> <sub>3</sub>	$-t_{1,2} - t_5$	—
<b>5</b> <sub>5</sub>	$-t_3 - t_5$	—
<b>5</b> <sub>6</sub>	$-t_4 - t_5$	—

## Even Singlet Curves

<b>1</b> <sub>1</sub>	$\pm(t_{1,2} - t_3)$	+
<b>1</b> <sub>2</sub>	$\pm(t_{1,2} - t_4)$	+
<b>1</b> <sub>4</sub>	$\pm(t_3 - t_4)$	+
<b>1</b> <sub>7</sub>	$t_1 - t_2$	+

- $W^1$  without singlets:

$$\mathbf{10}_1 \mathbf{10}_1 \mathbf{10}_2 \bar{\mathbf{5}}_6,$$

$$\mathbf{10}_1 \mathbf{10}_1 \mathbf{10}_3 \bar{\mathbf{5}}_5,$$

$$\mathbf{10}_1 \mathbf{10}_2 \mathbf{10}_3 \bar{\mathbf{5}}_3$$

# Case I: Matter and VEV Assignment

## Matter **10** Curves

<b>10</b> <sub>1</sub>	$t_{1,2}$	—	top
<b>10</b> <sub>2</sub>	$t_3$	—	no matter
<b>10</b> <sub>3</sub>	$t_4$	—	matter

## Matter **5** Curves

<b>5</b> <sub>3</sub>	$-t_{1,2} - t_5$	—	matter
<b>5</b> <sub>5</sub>	$-t_3 - t_5$	—	no matter
<b>5</b> <sub>6</sub>	$-t_4 - t_5$	—	matter

## Even Singlet Curves

<b>1</b> <sub>1</sub>	$\pm (t_{1,2} - t_3)$	+
<b>1</b> <sub>2</sub>	$\pm (t_{1,2} - t_4)$	+
<b>1</b> <sub>4</sub>	$\pm (t_3 - t_4)$	+
<b>1</b> <sub>7</sub>	$t_1 - t_2$	+

- $W^1$  without singlets:

$$\mathbf{10}_1 \mathbf{10}_1 \mathbf{10}_2 \bar{\mathbf{5}}_6,$$

$$\mathbf{10}_1 \mathbf{10}_1 \mathbf{10}_3 \bar{\mathbf{5}}_5,$$

$$\mathbf{10}_1 \mathbf{10}_2 \mathbf{10}_3 \bar{\mathbf{5}}_3$$

$\rightsquigarrow$  no matter on **10**<sub>2</sub>, **5**<sub>5</sub>

# Case I: Matter and VEV Assignment

## Matter **10** Curves

<b>10<sub>1</sub></b>	$t_{1,2}$	—	top
<b>10<sub>2</sub></b>	$t_3$	—	no matter
<b>10<sub>3</sub></b>	$t_4$	—	matter

## Matter **5** Curves

<b>5<sub>3</sub></b>	$-t_{1,2} - t_5$	—	matter
<b>5<sub>5</sub></b>	$-t_3 - t_5$	—	no matter
<b>5<sub>6</sub></b>	$-t_4 - t_5$	—	matter

## Even Singlet Curves

<b>1<sub>1</sub></b>	$\pm(t_{1,2} - t_3)$	+
<b>1<sub>2</sub></b>	$\pm(t_{1,2} - t_4)$	+
<b>1<sub>4</sub></b>	$\pm(t_3 - t_4)$	+
<b>1<sub>7</sub></b>	$t_1 - t_2$	+

- $W^1$  without singlets:

$$\mathbf{10}_1 \mathbf{10}_1 \mathbf{10}_2 \bar{\mathbf{5}}_6,$$

$$\mathbf{10}_1 \mathbf{10}_1 \mathbf{10}_3 \bar{\mathbf{5}}_5,$$

$$\mathbf{10}_1 \mathbf{10}_2 \mathbf{10}_3 \bar{\mathbf{5}}_3$$

$\rightsquigarrow$  no matter on **10<sub>2</sub>**, **5<sub>5</sub>**

- $W^1$  with singlets:

e.g.  $\mathbf{10}_1 \mathbf{10}_1 \mathbf{10}_3 \bar{\mathbf{5}}_6 \mathbf{1}_4,$

$$\mathbf{10}_1 \mathbf{10}_1 \mathbf{10}_3 \bar{\mathbf{5}}_3 \mathbf{1}_1$$

# Case I: Matter and VEV Assignment

## Matter $\mathbf{10}$ Curves

$\mathbf{10}_1$	$t_{1,2}$	—	top
$\mathbf{10}_2$	$t_3$	—	no matter
$\mathbf{10}_3$	$t_4$	—	matter

## Matter $\mathbf{5}$ Curves

$\mathbf{5}_3$	$-t_{1,2} - t_5$	—	matter
$\mathbf{5}_5$	$-t_3 - t_5$	—	no matter
$\mathbf{5}_6$	$-t_4 - t_5$	—	matter

## Even Singlet Curves

$\mathbf{1}_1$	$\pm(t_{1,2} - t_3)$	+	no VEV
$\mathbf{1}_2$	$\pm(t_{1,2} - t_4)$	+	VEV
$\mathbf{1}_4$	$\pm(t_3 - t_4)$	+	no VEV
$\mathbf{1}_7$	$t_1 - t_2$	+	VEV

- $W^1$  without singlets:

$$\mathbf{10}_1 \mathbf{10}_1 \mathbf{10}_2 \bar{\mathbf{5}}_6,$$

$$\mathbf{10}_1 \mathbf{10}_1 \mathbf{10}_3 \bar{\mathbf{5}}_5,$$

$$\mathbf{10}_1 \mathbf{10}_2 \mathbf{10}_3 \bar{\mathbf{5}}_3$$

$\rightsquigarrow$  no matter on  $\mathbf{10}_2$ ,  $\mathbf{5}_5$

- $W^1$  with singlets:

e.g.  $\mathbf{10}_1 \mathbf{10}_1 \mathbf{10}_3 \bar{\mathbf{5}}_6 \mathbf{1}_4,$

$$\mathbf{10}_1 \mathbf{10}_1 \mathbf{10}_3 \bar{\mathbf{5}}_3 \mathbf{1}_1$$

$\rightsquigarrow$  no VEVs for  $\mathbf{1}_1$ ,  $\mathbf{1}_4$

# Case I: Matter and VEV Assignment

## Matter **10** Curves

<b>10<sub>1</sub></b>	$t_{1,2}$	—	top
<b>10<sub>2</sub></b>	$t_3$	—	no matter
<b>10<sub>3</sub></b>	$t_4$	—	matter

## Matter **5** Curves

<b>5<sub>3</sub></b>	$-t_{1,2} - t_5$	—	matter
<b>5<sub>5</sub></b>	$-t_3 - t_5$	—	no matter
<b>5<sub>6</sub></b>	$-t_4 - t_5$	—	matter

## Even Singlet Curves

<b>1<sub>1</sub></b>	$\pm(t_{1,2} - t_3)$	+	no VEV
<b>1<sub>2</sub></b>	$\pm(t_{1,2} - t_4)$	+	VEV
<b>1<sub>4</sub></b>	$\pm(t_3 - t_4)$	+	no VEV
<b>1<sub>7</sub></b>	$t_1 - t_2$	+	VEV

- $W^1$  without singlets:

$$\mathbf{10}_1 \mathbf{10}_1 \mathbf{10}_2 \bar{\mathbf{5}}_6,$$

$$\mathbf{10}_1 \mathbf{10}_1 \mathbf{10}_3 \bar{\mathbf{5}}_5,$$

$$\mathbf{10}_1 \mathbf{10}_2 \mathbf{10}_3 \bar{\mathbf{5}}_3$$

$\rightsquigarrow$  no matter on **10<sub>2</sub>**, **5<sub>5</sub>**

- $W^1$  with singlets:

e.g.  $\mathbf{10}_1 \mathbf{10}_1 \mathbf{10}_3 \bar{\mathbf{5}}_6 \mathbf{1}_4,$

$$\mathbf{10}_1 \mathbf{10}_1 \mathbf{10}_3 \bar{\mathbf{5}}_3 \mathbf{1}_1$$

$\rightsquigarrow$  no VEVs for **1<sub>1</sub>**, **1<sub>4</sub>**

- $W^1$  will not be generated at any order: lack of  $t_3$  factor

# Case I: Down-Type Higgs

Higgs-like $\mathbf{5}$ Curves	Down-type Yukawas
$\bar{\mathbf{5}}_{H_u}$ $-t_1 - t_2$	
$\bar{\mathbf{5}}_1$ $-t_{1,2} - t_3$	
$\bar{\mathbf{5}}_2$ $-t_{1,2} - t_4$	
$\bar{\mathbf{5}}_4$ $-t_3 - t_4$	

# Case I: Down-Type Higgs

Higgs-like <b>5</b> Curves	Down-type Yukawas
$\bar{\mathbf{5}}_{H_u}$ ⚡ $-t_1 - t_2$	No masses at tree level or with singlets
$\bar{\mathbf{5}}_1$ $-t_{1,2} - t_3$	
$\bar{\mathbf{5}}_2$ ⚡ $-t_{1,2} - t_4$	No masses at tree level or with singlets
$\bar{\mathbf{5}}_4$ $-t_3 - t_4$	

- Down-type Higgs needs a factor of  $t_3$  to allow for Yukawa couplings (at any order)

# Case I: Down-Type Higgs

Higgs-like $\mathbf{5}$ Curves	Down-type Yukawas
$\bar{\mathbf{5}}_{H_u}$ ⚡ $-t_1 - t_2$	No masses at tree level or with singlets
$\bar{\mathbf{5}}_1$ ⚡ $-t_{1,2} - t_3$	either rank-two Yukawa matrix, or no up-type masses with singlets
$\bar{\mathbf{5}}_2$ ⚡ $-t_{1,2} - t_4$	No masses at tree level or with singlets
$\bar{\mathbf{5}}_4$ $-t_3 - t_4$	

- Down-type Higgs needs a factor of  $t_3$  to allow for Yukawa couplings (at any order)
- Down-type Yukawa should not be rank-two

# Case I: Down-Type Higgs

Higgs-like $\mathbf{5}$ Curves	Down-type Yukawas
$\bar{\mathbf{5}}_{H_u}$ ⚡ $-t_1 - t_2$	No masses at tree level or with singlets $\mu$ term
$\bar{\mathbf{5}}_1$ ⚡ $-t_{1,2} - t_3$	either rank-two Yukawa matrix, or no up-type masses with singlets
$\bar{\mathbf{5}}_2$ ⚡ $-t_{1,2} - t_4$	No masses at tree level or with singlets
$\bar{\mathbf{5}}_4$ $-t_3 - t_4$	

- Down-type Higgs needs a factor of  $t_3$  to allow for Yukawa couplings (at any order)
- Down-type Yukawa should not be rank-two
- String-scale  $\mu$  term for both Higgses on one curve

# Case I: Down-Type Higgs

Higgs-like $\mathbf{5}$ Curves	Down-type Yukawas
$\bar{\mathbf{5}}_{H_u}$ ⚡ $-t_1 - t_2$	No masses at tree level or with singlets $\mu$ term
$\bar{\mathbf{5}}_1$ ⚡ $-t_{1,2} - t_3$	either rank-two Yukawa matrix, or no up-type masses with singlets
$\bar{\mathbf{5}}_2$ ⚡ $-t_{1,2} - t_4$	No masses at tree level or with singlets
$\bar{\mathbf{5}}_4$ ✅ $-t_3 - t_4$	Rank-one Yukawa matrix, bottom quark heavy

- Down-type Higgs needs a factor of  $t_3$  to allow for Yukawa couplings (at any order)
- Down-type Yukawa should not be rank-two
- String-scale  $\mu$  term for both Higgses on one curve
- $\bar{\mathbf{5}}_4 = \bar{\mathbf{5}}_{H_d}$  is unique choice, tree-level coupling  $\bar{\mathbf{5}}_{H_d} \mathbf{10}_{\text{top}} \bar{\mathbf{5}}_3$

## Case I: Yukawas and CKM

- Third generation:  $\mathbf{10}_1$  and  $\bar{\mathbf{5}}_3$ , light generations:  $\mathbf{10}_3$  and  $\bar{\mathbf{5}}_6$
- Higgses:  $\bar{\mathbf{5}}_{H_u}$  and  $\bar{\mathbf{5}}_4$ , only  $\langle \mathbf{1}_2 \rangle \sim \epsilon$  required at first order
- Ignore  $\langle \mathbf{1}_7 \rangle$ ,  $\mathcal{O}(1)$  coefficients and nontrivial splits
- Yukawa matrices (schematically):

$$Y^u \sim Y^d \sim \begin{pmatrix} \epsilon^2 & \epsilon^2 & \epsilon \\ \epsilon^2 & \epsilon^2 & \epsilon \\ \epsilon & \epsilon & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

- CKM matrix:

$$V_{\text{CKM}} \sim \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & \epsilon \\ 1 & 1 & \epsilon \\ \epsilon & \epsilon & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

- Masses and mixings possible (though not a great fit)
- Degeneracy because three generations come from two curves

[Friedman, Morgan, Witten; Donagi, Wijnholt]

Now *semilocal* picture: Consider GUT surface using spectral cover approach

Main aim: Find homology classes of matter curves which allow to find the flux restrictions and thus the zero mode spectrum.

Two types of fluxes (actually,  $G$  four-form flux):

- $U(1) \subset SU(5)_\perp$  fluxes on matter curves (from the transverse branes): Determines (chiral) 4D zero modes for full GUT multiplets (by index theorem). These are still free parameters up to anomaly cancellation requirements.
- Hypercharge flux on  $S$  (globally trivial so hypercharge stays unbroken): Restrictions to matter curves splits  $SU(5)$  multiplets; homological relations between matter curves lead to relations between the splittings.

# Case I: Doublet-Triplet Splitting fails

- Higgs sector:

	(3, 1)	(1, 2)
$\mathbf{5}_{H_u}$	$M_{\mathbf{5}_{H_u}}$	$M_{\mathbf{5}_{H_u}} + N_8$
$\mathbf{5}_1$	$M_{\mathbf{5}_1}$	$M_{\mathbf{5}_1} - N_8$
$\mathbf{5}_2$	$M_{\mathbf{5}_2}$	$M_{\mathbf{5}_2} - N_8$
$\mathbf{5}_4$	$M_{\mathbf{5}_4}$	$M_{\mathbf{5}_4} + N_8$

- We can pairwise decouple unwanted triplets from  $\mathbf{5}_{H_u}$  and  $\mathbf{5}_2$ , and from  $\mathbf{5}_1$  and  $\mathbf{5}_4$  by coupling to VEV for  $\mathbf{1}_2$
- However:

$$\#(\text{doublets from } \mathbf{5}_{H_u}, \mathbf{5}_2) = \#(\text{triplets from } \mathbf{5}_{H_u}, \mathbf{5}_2)$$

- Problem persists even when allowing exotics from the matter sector
- Separately, down-type Higgs on  $\mathbf{5}_4$  cannot be realised
- Matter sector can be engineered easily
- Similar result for case II

# Conclusions

- Analysed F-Theory GUT in local and semilocal approach
- Goal: Use locally defined matter parity and additional  $U(1)$ s to ensure proton stability

# Conclusions

- Analysed F-Theory GUT in local and semilocal approach
- Goal: Use locally defined matter parity and additional  $U(1)$ s to ensure proton stability
- Local model is very constrained: Two cases only
- Neither case can be embedded in semilocal framework (using spectral cover) – first step towards global realisation fails
- Problem is doublet-triplet splitting in the Higgs sector, even when allowing for exotic matter
- Predictivity of local point in question – Crucial model features required to have nonlocal origin?

# Conclusions

- Analysed F-Theory GUT in local and semilocal approach
- Goal: Use locally defined matter parity and additional  $U(1)$ s to ensure proton stability
- Local model is very constrained: Two cases only
- Neither case can be embedded in semilocal framework (using spectral cover) – first step towards global realisation fails
- Problem is doublet-triplet splitting in the Higgs sector, even when allowing for exotic matter
- Predictivity of local point in question – Crucial model features required to have nonlocal origin?
- Possible loopholes: Matter representations might be more subtle than simple group theory intuition suggests

[Ceccotti, Heckman, Vafa; Donagi Wijnholt] [Esole, Yau; Marsano, Schäfer-Nameki]